



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,385	07/06/2001	Joyce A. Deleo	DC-0156	4729
26259 7590 02/08/2010 LICATA & TYRRELL P.C. 66 E. MAIN STREET MARLTON, NJ 08053				
EXAMINER JAGOE, DONNA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1619				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/08/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

poreilly@licataandtyrrell.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/857,385

Applicant(s)

DELEO ET AL.

Examiner

Donna Jagoe

Art Unit

1619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 18, 2009 has been entered.

Claim 1 is pending in this application.

Applicants' arguments filed September 15, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification as originally filed contains the following disclosures concerning methotrexate dosages:

Page 5 recites that group A received methotrexate immediately after surgery and on days 2 and 4 post surgery. Group B received saline at the same time and group C - sham operated animals receiving methotrexate the same as group A (day 1, day 2 and day 4). Fourteen days post surgery, group D (saline treated rats) received methotrexate on days 7, 9 and 11 post surgery. Group E received saline on days 7, 9 and 11. Group F (methotrexate treated rats) received saline on days 7, 9 and 11 post surgery. However, there are no instances where an animal received methotrexate at a dose level of 1 mg/kg every other day for up to 11 days. As noted above, the animals received at least a dose immediately post surgery (day 1) and a dose on day 2. This would not be "every other day". The first two doses are every day.

Written Description

An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams and formula that fully set forth the claimed invention.

Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

The Examiner is guided in his opinion that Applicant has not adequately described the presently claimed subject matter by the MPEP at § 2163 - 2163.05. In particular, Applicant's specification as originally filed contained a disclosure of methotrexate dosage ranges, e.g., "1mg/kg." (page 8, lines 14-15). Applicant's now claim a dosage range of "1 mg/kg every other day for up to 11 days", however, this represents a dosage subgenus that were not previously set forth or that would have been immediately envisaged by one skilled in the art from the specification as originally filed. "A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996)"(emphasis added), see MPEP § 2163(I)(A). Also, "See also *In re Smith*. 458 F.2d 1389, 1395, 173 USPQ 679, 683 (CCPA 1972) ('Whatever may be the viability of an inductive-deductive approach to arriving at a claimed subgenus, it cannot be said that such a subgenus is necessarily described by a genus encompassing it and a species upon which it reads.' (emphasis added)).", see MPEP § 2163.05(II).

Considering the teachings provided in the specification as originally filed, the Examiner finds that Applicants have failed to provide the necessary teachings, by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams and formula that fully set for the claimed invention, in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that Applicants had possession of the concept of "1 mg/kg every other day for up to 11

days".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaksh et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,180,716 A. and Heywood et al. and in further view of Drug Facts and Comparisons.

Yaksh et al. teach that spinal (intrathecal/epidural) administration of centrally acting agents, such as antineoplastics and analgesics is shown to have considerable therapeutic efficacy for treatment of pain, spasticity, central nervous system tumors and infections (column 1, lines 18-25) and teach that methotrexate is one of these centrally acting agents that is by intrathecal infusion (column 8, lines 33-39 and column 8, line 66 to column 9, line 8). Yaksh et al. does not teach treatment of radiculopathy, however Heywood et al. that rheumatoid arthritis causes cervical spine instability and is a causative factor in symptoms of radiculopathy (see abstract). Drug Facts and Comparisons teach administration of methotrexate for rheumatoid arthritis by ameliorating symptoms of inflammation (pain, swelling, stiffness) (page 1243). Doses recited for rheumatoid arthritis are from 7.5 mg/week to 15 mg/week (page 1244). It does not teach 1mg/kg every other day for up to 11 days, however, as anyone of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate, preferred dosages are merely exemplary and serve as useful guideposts for the physician. There are, however, many reasons for varying dosages, including by orders of magnitude; for instance, an extremely heavy patient or one having an unusually severe pain would require a correspondingly higher dosage. Furthermore, it is routine during animal and clinical studies to dramatically vary dosage to obtain data on parameters such as toxicity, such as administration every

other day to alleviate side effects. For these reasons, it would have been obvious to have used 1 mg/kg every other day for up to 11 days.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time it was made to employ methotrexate administered intrathecally for treatment of lower back pain with radiculopathy motivated by the teaching of Yaksh et al., who teaches the efficacy of methotrexate administered intrathecally and the teaching of the Heywood et al. that Rheumatoid arthritis causes cervical spine instability and is a causative factor in symptoms of radiculopathy (see abstract) combined with the teachings of Drug Facts and Comparisons that methotrexate is routinely employed for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis by ameliorating symptoms of inflammation.

Thus the claims fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, the claims are deemed properly rejected and none are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant states that "contrary to the examiner's suggestion, a rat does not weight [sic] 7.5 kg." Applicant further remarks that a rat weighs much less and this is well known in the art. In response, Although a claim should be interpreted in light of the specification disclosure, it is generally considered improper to read limitations contained in the specification into the claims. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969) and *In re Winkhaus*, 527 F.2d 637, 188 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1975), which

discuss the premise that one cannot rely on the specification to impart limitations to the claim that are not recited in the claim. The instant claim is drawn to reducing lower back pain in "an animal" and one of ordinary skill in the art would adjust the dosage to arrive at a therapeutically effective amount for a therapeutic protocol. Applicant has amended claim 1 and states that support for said amendment is located in the instant specification on pages 5-6. As stated supra, page 5 recites that group A received methotrexate immediately after surgery and on days 2 and 4 post surgery. Group B received saline at the same time and group C - sham operated animals receiving methotrexate the same as group A (day 1, day 2 and day 4). Fourteen days post surgery, group D (saline treated rats) received methotrexate on days 7, 9 and 11 post surgery. Group E received saline on days 7, 9 and 11. Group F (methotrexate treated rats) received saline on days 7, 9 and 11 post surgery. However, there are no instances where an animal received methotrexate at a dose level of 1 mg/kg every other day for up to 11 days. As noted above, the animals received at least a dose immediately post surgery (day 1) and a dose on day 2. This would not be "every other day". The first two doses are every day. Applicant further accuses the Examiner of using "common knowledge" however has not disclosed what common knowledge was relied on. The rejection was made under 35 USC 103(a) with evidentiary support from Yaksh et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,180,716 A. and Heywood et al. and in further view of Drug Facts and Comparisons.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne (Bonnie) Eyler can be reached on (571) 272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/YVONNE L. EYLER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1619

Donna Jagoe /D. J./
Examiner
Art Unit 1619

January 22, 2010